



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/433,427	11/04/1999	HEIKO H. LUDWIG	12990(SZ998-	2569

7590 05/31/2002

RICHARD L CATANIA ESQ
SCULLY SCOTT MURPHY & PRESSER
400 GARDEN CITY PLAZA
GARDEN CITY, NY 11530

EXAMINER

PARTON, KEVIN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2153

DATE MAILED: 05/31/2002

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/433,427

Applicant(s)

LUDWIG ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin Parton

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-18 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 04 November 1999 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on ____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). ____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. Acknowledgment is made of applicant's claim for foreign priority based on an application filed in the European Patent Office on 11/17/1998. It is noted, however, that applicant has not filed a certified copy of the 98121832.4 application as required by 35 U.S.C. 119(b).

Specification

2. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

3. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds the allowed number of words. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Drawings

4. The drawings are objected to because in the specification, reference is made to server computer "122" of the service provider (page 9, line 31). In the figure, this part is labeled "112". A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

5. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because:

Art Unit: 2153

- a. reference character "15" has been used to designate both a workflow template (page 10, line 14) and a whole outsourced work task (page 10, line 16); and
- b. reference characters "9" and "13 have been used to designate both mapping tables (page 10, line 21) and Access Devices (page 10, lines 25-26).

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "wo1", "wo2" (claim 2, lines 2 and 3). A proposed drawing correction, corrected drawings, or amendment to the specification to add the reference sign(s) in the description, are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) in view of Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) and Khan et al. (USPN 6,157,934).
9. Regarding claims 1 and 10, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) disclose a system for connection of a first server computer of a service requestor and a second server computer of a

Art Unit: 2153

service provider, each of said first server computer and said second server computer being connected to at least one client computer comprising:

- a. Means for providing a first and a second connector application for permitting said first server computer access to a copy of said first connector application and for permitting said second server computer access to a copy of said second connector application (column 30, lines 45-54).
- b. Means wherein said copies of first and second connector application each comprises a connection agreement for a first work task (column 30, lines 45-54).
- c. Means for said first work task to be transposed from said first service terminology to an input data set in common terminology (column 30, lines 54-62).
- d. Means for marshalling input data set to said second server computer over a common connection and said marshaled input data set being transposed to a second work task by said second server from common terminology into said second service terminology and said second work task being processed (column 30, line 62 through column 31, line 7).

Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose:

- a. Means wherein first server computer is running a first workflow management system application and said second server computer is running a second workflow management system application.
- b. Means wherein said first work task is part of a first workflow instance encompassed by said first workflow management system application.

Art Unit: 2153

- c. Means wherein said first connector application further comprises a first mapping table including a first service terminology and a common terminology, and which copy of said second connector application further comprises a second mapping table including a second service terminology and said common terminology.
- d. Means wherein first work task is transposed by said first mapping table
- e. Means wherein said marshaled input data is transposed to a second work task by said second mapping table from said common terminology.
- f. Means wherein said marshaled input data is processed by said second workflow management system.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification to the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774), as evidenced by Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) and Khan et al. (USPN 6,157,934).

In an analogous art, Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) teach a system for translation of requests between servers and clients having:

- a. Means wherein said first connector application further comprises a first mapping table including a first service terminology and a common terminology, and which copy of said second connector application further comprises a second mapping table including a second service terminology and said common terminology.
(column 4, lines 11-15)
- b. Means wherein first work task is transposed by said first mapping table (column 4, lines 11-15).

- c. Means wherein said marshaled input data is transposed to a second work task by said second mapping table (column 4, lines 11-15).

Given the teachings of Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bittinger et al. by the use of mapping tables for conversion, as disclosed by Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) in order to allow for configuration changes by the end user or system administrator without additional software development.

In an analogous art, Khan et al. (USPN 6,157,934) teach a system for workflow management having:

- a. Means wherein first server computer is running a first workflow management system application and said second server computer is running a second workflow management system application (column 2, lines 29-34).
- b. Means wherein said first work task is part of a first workflow instance encompassed by said first workflow management system application (column 2, lines 29-34).
- c. Means wherein said marshaled input data is processed by said second workflow management system (column 2, lines 29-34).

Given the teachings of Khan et al. (USPN 6,157,934), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bittinger et al. by employing workflow applications, such as disclosed by Khan et al. (USPN 6,157,934) in order to provide the function of passing work tasks from one server to another and to constrain the message format and type between the servers to this specific application type. Please note

Art Unit: 2153

that the specification of server to server or server to client communications is not significant in the claim. It is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that these machine types are interchangeable and can represent separate processors on a single machine.

10. Regarding claims 2 and 11, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Further, they teach:

- a. Means wherein said processed second work task generates a result, said result being transposed from said second service terminology into an output data set in said common terminology, said mapped output data set being marshaled to said first server computer over said common connection, and said marshaled output data being transposed from said common terminology into said first service terminology (column 31, lines 58-64)

Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose:

- a. Means wherein said result is transposed by said second mapping table and said mapped output data set being transposed by said first mapping table.

Nonetheless, these features are well known in the art and would have been an obvious modification of the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774), as evidenced by Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469).

In an analogous art, Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) teach a system for translation of requests between servers and clients having:

- a. Means wherein said result is transposed by said second mapping table and said mapped output data set being transposed by said first mapping table (column 4, lines 11-15).

Given the teaching of Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469), a person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of modifying Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) by employing the use of a mapping table for conversion, as disclosed by Tan et al. (USPN 6,314,469) in order to allow for configuration changes by the end user or system administrator without additional software development.

11. Regarding claims 3 and 12, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. They further teach means wherein said copy of said first connector application resides in a first access device of said service requestor; said first access device comprising a first access computer including said first connector application (column 30, lines 45-54).

12. Regarding claims 4 and 13, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. They further teach means wherein said copy of said second connector application resides in a second access device of said service provider; said second access device comprising a second access computer including said second connector application (column 30, lines 45-54).

13. Regarding claims 5 and 14, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose

Art Unit: 2153

specifically means wherein said copy of the first connector application resides in said first server computer of said service requestor.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of placing the connector application on the server machine. This allows administrators immediate access to the table and the ability to protect the table from outside alterations or corruptions.

14. Regarding claims 6 and 15, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein said copy of the second connector application resides in said second server computer of said service provider.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of placing the connector application on the server machine. This allows administrators immediate access to the table and the ability to protect the table from outside alterations or corruptions.

15. Regarding claims 7 and 16, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein said copy of said first connector application resides in said first client computer.

Art Unit: 2153

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of placing the connector application on the client machine. This gives mapping table access to the end user if modification is necessary on the client side.

16. Regarding claims 8 and 17, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose specifically means wherein said copy of said second connector application resides in said second client computer.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of placing the connector application on the client machine. This gives mapping table access to the end user if modification is necessary on the client side.

17. Regarding claims 9 and 18, Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) (as applied to claims 1 and 10) teach all the limitations as described above. Although the system disclosed by Bittinger et al. (USPN 5,754,774) shows substantial features of the claimed invention, it fails to disclose means wherein said first workflow management system application is essentially the same as said second workflow management system application.

A person having ordinary skill in the art would have readily recognized the desirability and advantages of applications on interconnected machines being essentially the same. For interoperability to have a purpose, the applications would need to read the same types of data and be used for the same types of functions.

Conclusion

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bingham et al. (USPN 5,557,790) teach a system for storage of data in a standardized format, submissions and requests are handled and converted by a single server. Cheng et al. (USPN 5,881,232) teach a system for the conversion and application of client SQL queries, a server converts queries to the proper format, executes them, and then reformats results for the client.


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kevin Parton whose telephone number is (703)306-0543. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:00AM - 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glenton Burgess can be reached on (703)305-4792. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703)746-9242 for regular communications and (703)746-7238 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Kevin Parton
Examiner
Art Unit 2153

ksp
May 13, 2002


GLENTON B. BURGESS
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100